



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/782,444

02/19/2004

Anthony Edward Martinez

8185P029

5166

76073

7590

05/13/2009

InfoPrint Solutions/ Blakely  
1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

THOMAS, ASHISH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/13/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                                      |   |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/782,444 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>MARTINEZ, ANTHONY EDWARD |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>ASHISH K. THOMAS  | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2625                         |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE \_\_\_\_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the independent claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Please note that the Applicant argues that the cited prior art do not teach the concept of identifying a set of markers on a page. This deficiency is corrected in the modified rejection. The Hernandez reference teaches identifying print zones or boundaries. The Examiner is equating the print zones to the set of markers.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogaki(U.S. 6,771,383) in view of Douglin(U.S. 6,619,695) and further in view of Hernandez(U.S. 6,650,428)

Regarding claim 13, Ogaki teaches a printing system for processing separator pages(**Column 4, lines 46-47 describes a separator sheet**) used for separating print jobs being output from said printing system, said printing system comprising: a printer device(**Machine 1 in figure 1**); an input device for providing an input separator page to said printer for identifying a second print job(**Column 8, lines 1-10 teaches the detection of separator sheet. This, in turn, inherently teaches a device that**

**provides the separator sheet to the printing unit.);** said printer device being operable for printing second printing job information thereby providing a second print job separator page.**(Figure 13 illustrates that a separator page is printed with each job or document. This implies the existence of the second print job separator page.)**

But Ogaki does not teach printer device being operable for obscuring said first print job information if said first print job information is determined to be present on said input separator page. Ogaki doesn't teach using the same separator page for a plurality of jobs.

Douglin, on the other hand, teaches printer device being operable for obscuring said first print job information if said first print job information is determined to be present on said input separator page. **(Column 3, lines 5-28 discloses a reusable fax cover sheet that is used for a plurality of print jobs. Prior job information is erased for newer job information.)** Furthermore, note that Douglin discloses the use of same separator page for a plurality of jobs**(column 3, lines 5-28).**

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Ogaki with Douglin. The Ogaki/Douglin combination teaches reusing a page for more than one job by obscuring the prior job data.

The motivation behind combining Ogaki and Douglin is to prevent the wasteful usage of paper by re-using the same separator page for a plurality of print jobs.

The Ogaki/Douglin combination does not teach an image acquisition device arranged between said input device and said printer device, said image acquisition

Art Unit: 2625

device being operable for obtaining image information identifying information contained on the page; and processing means coupled to said image acquisition device for determining if said page contains first information indicating use of the page as a first job page by identifying a first set of end markers.

Hernandez, on the other hand, teaches an image acquisition device arranged between said input device and said printer device, said image acquisition device being operable for obtaining image information identifying information contained on the page(**Column 3, lines 20-25 discloses identifying and demarcating certain texts in a page. This reads on identifying the information on a page. Therefore, the acquisition device is inherently taught in the reference**); and processing means coupled to said image acquisition device for determining if said page contains first information indicating use of the page as a first page by identifying a first set of end markers(**Column 3, lines 3-10 talks about zones. Furthermore, figure 2b also illustrates these zones. These zones have boundaries, which in turn reads on the end markers stated in the claim language.**) Hernandez further teaches that information contained on one side of the paper is not relevant on the second side(**Column 3, lines 45-54**). As a result, the information one side is crossed out.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Hernandez with Ogaki and Douglin. This combination will yield an image acquisition device arranged between said input device and said printer device, said image acquisition device being operable for obtaining image information identifying information contained on said input separator page; and

Art Unit: 2625

processing means coupled to said image acquisition device for determining if said input separator page contains first print job information indicating use of the input separator page as a first print job page by identifying a first set of end markers on the input separator page, said printer device being operable for obscuring said first print job information and the first set of end markers if said first print job information is determined to be present on said input separator page. This combination will also yield an input separator page wherein second job information is printed between a second set of end markers at a predetermined position relative to said obscured first print job information.

The motivation here is that end markers or print zones would help realize the proper boundary of a set of data. Only data contained within that boundary can be modified.

Regarding claim 1, it is rejected in the same manner as claim 13 since a corresponding method is disclosed in claim 1.

Regarding claim 7, it is rejected in the same manner as claim 13 since it discloses a program that corresponds to the system claimed in claim 13. Furthermore, column 2, lines 42-50 of Hernandez teaches a memory 17 that stores data related to the printed image. This portion of the reference also discloses a communication between print engine 19 and the printer controller 18; this reads on the processing circuitry stated in the claim language.

Regarding claims 4, 10, and 16, Ogaki additionally teaches that the determining is accomplished by obtaining a photo image of said input separator page. **(Column 2, lines 38-45)**

Regarding claims 5, 11, and 17, Ogaki additionally teaches printing said second print job; assembling said second print job with said second print job separator page; and outputting said second print job with said second print job separator page from said printer. **(Note that column 8, lines 7-15 teaches that a separator page is attached to each print job, and the combined documents are outputted accordingly.)**

Regarding claims 6, 12, and 18, Douglin further teaches inputting said second print job separator page containing said second print job information for receiving by said printer system for processing a third input separator page to be used to identify a third print job. **(Column 3, lines 5-28 discloses a re-usable sheet. This implies more than one jobs, so a second and third jobs are established in the teaching.)**

3. Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogaki(U.S. 6,771,383) in view of Douglin(U.S. 6,619,695), Hernandez(U.S. 6,650,428), and Mei(U.S. 6,236,831).

Regarding claims 2, 8, and 14, the combination of Ogaki, Douglin, and Hernandez teaches the subject matter claimed in the respective base claims.

But this combination is silent on obtaining a bit map image.

Mei teaches obtaining a bit map image**(Column 2, lines 38-45 teaches scanning a page. This reads on obtaining a bit mapped image.)**

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Ogaki, Douglin, and Hernandez with Mei to put forth a determining means that obtains a bit map images of the input separator page.

The motivation simply is that bit map of a page will easily allow the determination of data items that need to be obscured.

Regarding claims 3, 9, and 15, the combination of Ogaki, Douglin, and Hernandez teaches the subject matter claimed in the respective base claims.

But this combination is silent on scanning a page using an optical scanning device.

Mei teaches scanning a page using an optical scanning device (**Column 2, lines 38-45 teaches scanning a page.**)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the present invention, to modify Ogaki, Douglin, and Hernandez with Mei to put forth a printing system wherein determining is accomplished by scanning the input separator page using an optical scanning device.

The motivation simply is that the storage of the scanned image will realize an easier determination of data items that need to be obscured.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ASHISH K. THOMAS whose telephone number is (571)272-0631. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 0700-1530 EST.



If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ashish K Thomas/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625